

## The Refugee Classical Scholars in the USA: An Evaluation of their Contribution

WILLIAM M. CALDER III

Because the best American classical scholarship has never shed its German origins and because American classical scholarship has never outdistanced parallel German effort in the sense that American medicine and natural sciences have, it provides a particularly revealing, albeit neglected, specimen of cross-cultural influence, well documented, often productive, and with a lifespan of some 150 years. For purposes of historical presentation I suggest four periods in the history of German influence on American classics. Because the third period, that of the refugee scholars of the 1930s, is understandable only within the context of the other three, I shall, therefore, discuss the whole with obvious emphasis on the third period. The four periods briefly are:<sup>1</sup>

1. Teutonomania: 1853 (B. L. Gildersleeve's Göttingen doctorate) to 1914 (outbreak of European War);

2. The Reaction against Germany: 7 May 1915 (sinking of the Lusitania) to 15 September 1935 (the Nuremberg Laws for "the protection of German blood and honor");

<sup>1</sup> See my "Die Geschichte der klassischen Philologie in den Vereinigten Staaten," *Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien* 11 (1966) 213-40, where I first suggested these divisions and first listed the refugee scholars and sought to evaluate their influence. An important supplement from the German side is W. Ludwig, "Amtsenthebung und Emigration klassischer Philologen," *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 7 (1984) 161-78. For a welcome recent study that sees the refugee scholars in an historical context see A. Bertini Malgarini, "I classicisti tedeschi in America fra il 1933 e il 1942: Aspetti storici e metodologici," *La Cultura* 27 (1989) 155-66. L. A. Coser, "Werner Jaeger (1888-1961) and the Impact of European Refugees on American Classical Scholarship," in *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences* (New Haven and London 1984) 271-77, is derivative but valuable because classics are seen in the context of the wider immigration. For a rare autobiographical account from a neighboring field (linguistics) see H. Kahane, "The Refugee of the Thirties: A Personal Memoir," *Tennessee Linguistics* 6.2 (1986) 8-17. Two recently published memoirs by emigrant scholars deserve notice: F. Gilbert, *A European Past: Memoirs 1905-45* (New York and London 1988) and E. Voegelin, *Autobiographical Reflections*, ed. with an introduction by E. Sandoz (Baton Rouge and London 1989).

3. Adolf Hitler and American Classics: 1935 to 1968 (the so-called "Reform" of the West German Universities);

4. The Second Emigration: 1968 to 1990.

My exposition will proceed within the framework of these four periods. The subject is much in flux. All sorts of archival material is coming to light almost weekly. Interest in the subject is burgeoning. For the first time there is attention from the German side. I think especially of the work of Volker Losemann and Bernhard vom Brocke.<sup>2</sup> Let us turn to the formative period 1853–1914.

The two general studies on the rise of graduate education in the United States in the nineteenth century, Storr (1953) and Diehl (1978), a prematurely published Yale doctoral dissertation, suffer fatally from the fact that neither knows Greek or Latin and so both miss the crucial role of German-educated classical scholars in establishing American graduate schools. The three great formative figures are: Basil L. Gildersleeve (1831–1924), Paul Shorey (1857–1934) and William Abbott Oldfather (1880–1945). This is not the place to discuss their publications. Oldfather alone wrote over 500 articles for Pauly–Wissowa, proof of his colossal industry and breadth. Why did they go to Germany?<sup>3</sup>

First, it was impossible to study at the doctoral level in the United States. There were no research libraries. Only the later purchase of German private libraries made such study feasible. Oldfather arranged that Illinois buy the libraries of Johannes Vahlen and Wilhelm Dittenberger. The rather silly but well-intentioned Ernst Sihler, whose autobiography *From Maumee to Thames and Tiber: The Life-Story of an American Classical Scholar* (New York 1930) preserves facts, arranged that New York University buy that of his teacher Emil Hübner. Paul de Lagarde's library ended up there

<sup>2</sup> See V. Losemann, *Nationalsozialismus und Antike: Studien zur Entwicklung des Faches Alte Geschichte 1933–45*, Historische Perspektiven 7 (Hamburg 1977), with my review at *CP* 76 (1981) 166–69, and B. vom Brocke, "Der deutsch-amerikanische Professoren Austausch," *Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch* 31 (1981) 128–82. For Eduard Meyer at Harvard in 1909/10 see M. H. Chambers, "The 'Most Eminent Living Historian, the One Final Authority': Meyer in America," in *Eduard Meyer: Leben und Leistung eines Universalhistorikers*, ed. W. M. Calder III and A. Demandt, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 112 (Leiden 1990) 97–131.

<sup>3</sup> See C. Diehl, *Americans and German Scholarship 1770–1870* (New Haven and London 1978), R. J. Storr, *The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America* (Chicago 1953), L. R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago and London 1965) and, for an honest presentation of the positive influence of Germany on American classics and the reaction against it, see E. C. Kopff, "Wilamowitz and Classical Philology in the United States of America: An Interpretation," *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren*, ed. W. M. Calder III, H. Flashar and T. Lindken (Darmstadt 1985) 558–80. For Gildersleeve, Oldfather and Shorey see Ward W. Briggs, Jr., "Basil L. Gildersleeve," *Classical Scholarship: A Biographical Encyclopedia*, ed. Ward W. Briggs, Jr. and W. M. Calder III (New York and London 1990) 93–118; J. Buckler, "William Abbott Oldfather," *ibid.* 346–52; E. C. Kopff, "Paul Shorey," *ibid.* 447–53.

too. Hermann Sauppe, Wilamowitz' predecessor at Göttingen, left his library to Columbia because the king who founded Columbia had earlier been the elector who had founded the Georgia Augusta. Some of it ended in Bryn Mawr. More recently the Center for Hellenic Studies purchased Werner Jaeger's library from his widow. McMaster has purchased Karl Barwick's (Jena), Tulane Margarete Bieber's and some American college Walter Marg's.

There were no libraries. There were no scholars. The best source for the anti-intellectualism of American colleges before the Hopkins and Chicago is Henry Seidel Canby, *Alma Mater* (New York 1936; repr. 1975). The outlook is that of an English public school. In starkest contrast to the Pforte of Wilamowitz' day, the hero is the athlete. Neither scholarship nor even the intellectual life exists. Dr. Thomas Arnold, the Headmaster of Rugby and apostle of muscular Christianity, would thoroughly have approved.

The first American doctorate in classics was earned nonetheless at Yale in 1861 by James Morris Whiton, with a six page handwritten dissertation, entitled *Brevis Vita, Ars Longa*, the sort of essay Nietzsche and Wilamowitz wrote in an afternoon at Schulpforte.<sup>4</sup> But why Germany and not England? The ancient universities were provincial finishing schools for the sons of clergy and the ruling class.<sup>5</sup> Compare Mark Pattison's reminiscences of undergraduate Oxford with Gibbon's. No change. They remind us of Gildersleeve on Princeton. Or E. F. Benson, *As We Were* for Cambridge ca. 1890. Theodor Mommsen acknowledged only one scholar in England, Henry Bradshaw. Or indeed Eduard Fraenkel's despair at Oxford preserved in Jaeger's letter to Lietzmann of 29 November 1936.<sup>6</sup> But it was not only the lack of scholarship at Oxford and Cambridge. Hatred of the English sent young Americans into the arms of the Germans. Gildersleeve's candor here is invaluable (*AJP* 37 [1916] 496):

In the fifties an American Anglomaniac was a rarity and the German attitude towards English scholars gave no offence to the patriotic American neophyte, for I was brought up on the memories of my revolutionary ancestors. I bore a deep-seated hereditary grudge against those whose forbears were responsible for the expulsion of the Acadians, the sufferings of Valley Forge, the burning of Norwalk, the

<sup>4</sup> See R. P. Rosenberg, "The First American Doctor of Philosophy Degree," *Journal of Higher Education* 32 (1961) 387-94.

<sup>5</sup> See especially A. J. Engel, *From Clergyman to Don: The Rise of the Academic Profession in Nineteenth Century England*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1984) and J. A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School* (Cambridge 1981).

<sup>6</sup> See G. W. Prothero, *A Memoir of Henry Bradshaw, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and University Librarian* (London 1888) 314-15, 333-34 and W. Jaeger in *Glanz und Niedergang der deutschen Universität: 50 Jahre deutscher Wissenschaftsgeschichte in Briefen an und von Hans Lietzmann (1899-1942)*, ed. K. Aland (Berlin and New York 1979) 846.

insolent behavior of British officers during the occupation of Charleston, and I was quite ready to be impressed by the judgments of my German masters.

These young men sat at the feet of titans, men like August Boeckh, Jacob Bernays, Friedrich Ritschl, Johannes Vahlen, Otto Crusius, Wilhelm Christ. A later one, Edward Fitch, at Göttingen heard Friedrich Leo and wrote his dissertation on Apollonius Rhodius under Wilamowitz, whom later at Berlin Grace Macurdy and William Scott Ferguson heard.

The number of American students studying at German universities in the second half of the nineteenth century steadily rose. Until the middle of the nineties they formed the largest foreign group, followed by the Russians. Whole parts of the American educational system were remodeled after the German, from kindergarten to graduate school. By 1900 whole faculties at American universities were made up largely of professors with German doctorates. The theologian Francis G. Peabody at Harvard, the first American exchange-professor in Germany on 30 October 1905 in his Antrittsvorlesung in the presence of the Kaiser revealed that 22 Harvard professors had taken a German doctorate.<sup>7</sup> These men returned to their country. Many formed graduate faculties after the German model (with teaching by lectures and seminars and division into departments) and produced streams of doctoral students. Gildersleeve directed 67 dissertations, Shorey 57, and Oldfather 47. That means 171 scholars, the last of whom, Revilo P. Oliver (Urbana), still lives in retirement. For some 100 years 171 American scholars trained by German-trained men filled key positions in the United States in classics. Long German hegemony over American classical studies gave them an enduring seriousness and exactitude that until very recently was in stark contrast to insular British dilettantism. Contrast Gilbert Murray and Gildersleeve, Sir John Sheppard and Oldfather, Henry Jackson and Paul Shorey. Two general points deserve notice regarding the formative German period.

1. Most unfortunately, with the notable exception of Gildersleeve, who still heard Boeckh, a narrow post-Humboldtian university, well on the way to overspecialization and pedantry, influenced the creators of American graduate schools<sup>8</sup> and in the case of philology the undistinguished generation between Boeckh–Hermann–K. O. Müller and Wilamowitz. Dissertations like H. W. Smyth, later Eliot Professor of Greek at Harvard, *Der Diphthong EI im Griechischen* (Diss. Göttingen 1884) (he missed Wilamowitz by one semester!) and Alfredus Gudemann, *De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo* (Diss. Berlin 1888) under Vahlen, whose example later inspired his own commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics*, were not just the norm but the best. Some were the kernel of later work on a large scale, Shorey on Plato's *Laws* or Oldfather on Locris, which later became the great Pauly–Wissowa article.

<sup>7</sup> See vom Brocke (above, note 2) 137.

<sup>8</sup> See P. R. Sweet, *Wilhelm von Humboldt. A Biography* II (Columbus, OH 1980) 70.

These exceptions cannot alleviate the incalculable damage bequeathed to American classical scholarship because of the chronology of its origins. We missed both Wilhelm von Humboldt and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.

2. There is an important difference between English and American attraction to German Wissenschaft in the second half of the nineteenth century. The repressive burden of religious orthodoxy turned young English liberals, like Jowett, who introduced Hegel to Oxford, and especially the Scot, William Robertson Smith, whose heresy trials (1877–81) stemming from his post-Mosaic dating of Deuteronomy in the Encyclopaedia Britannica article, "Bible," won international notoriety, to German higher criticism of the Bible. Smith's friendship with Albrecht Ritschl and Julius Wellhausen is famous. At Balliol in the fifties it became an affectation of liberals to employ German for what could just as well have been said in English.<sup>9</sup> English intellectuals adored Germany until the proclamation of the Second Reich in 1871. Prussia suddenly had become a rival. Contrarily young American *conservatives*, many of the best Southerners, were attracted still to Prussia.

Notice should be taken of the professorial exchange between Prussia and the USA beginning in 1905 largely through the initiative of Friedrich Althoff and encouraged by Theodore Roosevelt and Kaiser Wilhelm II (both liked hunting). Benjamin I. Wheeler was Theodore Roosevelt Professor at Berlin in 1909–10, although he lectured on "Kulturgeschichte der USA" and not classics, and Paul Shorey with unfortunate consequences in 1913–14. Under this program Eduard Meyer was guest-professor at Harvard in 1909–10, when he began his famous book on the origin of the Mormons. Recall also that at this time Chicago was the third largest German-speaking city in the world. German visiting lecturers had begun earlier: Wilhelm Dörpfeld in 1909. He needed money to install central heating in his Ithaca home.

I have not seen discussed a neglected phenomenon, the anti-Germanism of American academics before World War I. Part was due to vestigial Puritanism, the shock and rage that greeted Eduard Meyer's lectures on cheerful, beer-drinking German students. Part grew from pride. American scholarship is old enough to stand alone and not remain a step-child of the German. One finds traces of this in Gildersleeve but the *locus classicus* is Shorey's essay in *The Nation* of 1911:

Our task is to redefine and so far as may be to harmonize the aims of culture and scholarship without undue concessions to the gushing dilettante, and to emancipate ourselves from slavish subservience to German influence without losing the lessons or forgetting the debt of gratitude that we owe to Germany.

<sup>9</sup> See N. C. Chaudhuri, *Scholar Extraordinary: The Life of Professor the Rt. Hon. Friedrich Max Müller, P.C.* (London 1974) 100. For the change, see P. M. Kennedy, *The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism 1860–1914*<sup>3</sup> (London 1990).

That I find moderate, sensible, indeed expected. But at Harvard there was trouble brewing and its name was Charles Eliot Norton (1827–1908). This is not the place to praise his known services to classics, founder of the American Institute of Archaeology, one of the founders of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. With John Williams White he secured for American classics their greatest benefactor, James Loeb. A liberal, he allowed his politics to pervert his scholarship. I recall only his interpretation of the Cathedral of Orvieto as a monument to liberalism. His biographer, Kermit Vanderbilt, candidly remarks:<sup>10</sup>

The academic reputation of his books, in fact, is hard to describe accurately since his own friends usually wrote the reviews.

Norton was a rabid and influential anglophile, friend of Charles Dickens, close friend and literary executor of John Ruskin, literary executor of Thomas Carlyle, honorary doctor of Oxford and Cambridge. He had the patronizing love of Italians that has characterized many later American classicists. But he was a Germanophobe. He never learned the language well enough to speak it. He never studied at a German university. He never earned a doctorate. He was in Italy during the Franco-Prussian War (1870–71) and shared English disapproval of the German initiative. In autumn 1871 he settled in Dresden (a natural choice for an art-historian). He did not like the Germans, who rightly thought him a dilettante. He writes from Dresden 17 November 1871 to George Curtis:<sup>11</sup>

In Italy one feels as if one had had experience . . . had learnt to know *something*, if but very little, and could at least enjoy *much*. Here, on the contrary, one is convicted of inexperience and ignorance at every turn, everybody is hard at work learning and knows already a vast deal, and you are forced to begin to go to school again with the sense of having much lost time to make up for, and of the impropriety of enjoyment unless the pleasure is united with instruction.

Norton detests the Germans because they demand that he know something and work hard. Later in the same letter:

The German has been surfeited with metaphysics and ontology till he has taken a disgust to them. Nothing that has not material value pleases him. Ideas he despises; facts are his treasure.

This after some six weeks in a country whose language he cannot speak. Things were made worse by the death of his wife after the birth of their sixth child in Dresden in February. The German experience for Norton was unpleasant and painful. Until the year of his death he retained the view that

<sup>10</sup> K. Vanderbilt, *Charles Eliot Norton: Apostle of Culture in a Democracy* (Cambridge 1959) 182–83.

<sup>11</sup> *Letters of Charles Eliot Norton with Biographical Comment*, ed. S. Norton and M. A. Dewolf Howe (Boston and New York 1913) I 410, 412.

Germans are stupid pedants who avoid the important and soil the beautiful. In December 1901 he writes of American graduate students returning from Germany (Vanderbilt, p. 182): "Germanized pedants . . . ill-taught in Germany by the masters of the art of useless learning." In May 1907 after Gilbert Murray's and S. H. Butcher's Harvard lectures he writes to James Loeb (*Letters* II 376):

These two Englishmen have illustrated the worth of good English scholarship, exhibiting not merely thorough learning, but an admirable sense of the true ends to which learning should be devoted. It is a great pity that so many of our American scholars, old and young, have preferred the methods which lead only to the acquisition of facts often of no importance, to those which lead to the nobler cultivation of the intelligence and of the taste, and to the appreciation of the true ends of the study of language and of literature . . .

Ruskin would have approved. The facts, not unimportant, are that Murray's and Butcher's lectures are deservedly forgotten today and that Norton had never read through a first-rate book of German classical scholarship. Norton's ignorant praise of dilettantism and *aperçu* at the expense of hard work and facts gave pseudo-respectability to a poison that until today has befouled the waters of American classical scholarship. One might investigate the influence of Norton on T. S. Eliot and the Norton-Eliot *Vorbild* on the Harvard Hellenist, J. H. Finley, friend of C. M. Bowra and vehement critic of Eduard Fraenkel, who taught Dante from Norton's translation and in many ways saw himself as Norton's successor. In short, academic anti-Germanism had begun in this country before World War I. We now turn to the second period, the Reaction against Germany, 7 May 1915 (sinking of the *Lusitania*) until 15 September 1935 (the Nuremberg Laws).

Paul Shorey's hysterical racist harangue of 1919 opens the new era, the Jubilee Address of the American Philological Association held at their meeting in Pittsburgh on 30 December 1919, six months after the Treaty of Versailles, where Woodrow Wilson set the stage for National Socialism. John Adams Scott was in the President's chair. Gildersleeve was in the audience. Shorey stated publicly (*TAPA* 50 [1919] 39):

I would be willing to maintain against any comer the paradox that Wilamowitz' recent edition of the *Agamemnon* is no improvement on the little Harper text of Paley that I used to carry in my pocket.

Or (58):

In what may be called the virtuosity of scholarship Jebb is easily first . . . of all European scholars since the Renaissance.

Or finally—and how this must have embarrassed Gildersleeve (59):

If [Gildersleeve's] scattered and too often overlooked work could be

collected and systematized the tomes of Wilamowitz would not outweigh it in any judicious scales.

I am more ashamed of Shorey than of Norton. Norton was vain, ignorant and superficial. Shorey was too learned and intelligent not to have known that he was lying, that he put politics, hate and revenge before truth.

Sides were quickly drawn up: the octogenarian Gildersleeve, almost a *Denkmal der Wissenschaft*, the loyal and not entirely ineffective Edward Fitch, Wilamowitz' only American doctoral student,<sup>12</sup> and Oldfather, powerful and a fighter, against Shorey, Scott and their followers. Oldfather believed that the *res publica litterarum* transcended national boundaries and political conflicts. This was itself a German idea rather than an English or French one. The French expelled Wilamowitz from their Academy after the outbreak of hostilities. Wilamowitz as Rector signed his diplomas (*Erinnerungen*<sup>2</sup> 316): *plerarumque in hoc orbe academiarum socius, e Parisina honoris causa eiectus*. Just so King George V struck Wilhelm II from the Order of the Garter and removed his banners from the Chapel at Windsor with those of five other Prussian royals. Wilhelm stripped no hostile sovereign of orders. The Prussian Academy expelled no member on political grounds. The politicization of the Academy under the Nazis was different and petit bourgeois. An international, aristocratic ruling class was gone.

Only with difficulty today can one imagine the criticism that Oldfather met. In 1917 in the midst of war hysteria he was informally but publicly charged with pro-German sentiments and disloyalty to the United States. He demanded and received a public hearing where he proved that the accusations were baseless. As late as 1920 he was rebuked by Wallace Lindsay for seeking international collaboration in order to save the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, a German enterprise. My own teacher, the New Testament scholar and Quaker historian, Henry Joel Cadbury (1883–1974), was fired in 1919 from the Quaker college Haverford for advocating mercy toward the defeated adversary.<sup>13</sup> But irreparable damage had been done. American entry into World War I had brought overnight abolishment of German in schools. Spanish filled the vacuum. The endowment and growing prestige of the Rhodes Scholarships with what E. C. Kopff has called their “steady production of college presidents, presidents, politicians, and bureaucrats” allowed an anti-German narrow-minded Oxford to replace Berlin. German books in classics (unlike those in theology) were not regularly translated

<sup>12</sup> See W. M. Calder III, “The Correspondence of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf with Edward Fitch,” *HSCP* 83 (1979) 369–96.

<sup>13</sup> See M. H. Bacon, *This Life Speaks: The Legacy of Henry Joel Cadbury* (Philadelphia 1987) 31–49 and W. J. Cotter, “A Letter from Henry J. Cadbury to Adolf von Harnack,” *HThR* 78 (1985) 219–22. For the attack on Oldfather see Buckler (above, note 3) 348: “one of the ugliest episodes in the history of the University of Illinois,” and K. M. Grisso, *David Kinley, 1861–1944: The Career of the Fifth President of the University of Illinois* (Diss. Illinois 1980) 325–50.

into English as they are into Italian. More and more German scholars became known to American students as Celsus had become known to Christians, through their American detractors. Wilamowitz' fate at the hands of the Scott-Shorey-Cherniss axis is only the most famous example. In archaeology the wave of anti-Germanism turned the discipline from *Kunstgeschichte* to what may be euphemistically called cultural anthropology, rooftiles, dowel clamps, mouldings, drainage systems. Americans adored William Bell Dinsmoor, the American Dörpfeld, and never read Ernst Buschor. Sterling Dow called Rhys Carpenter the only American art historian (that is during the anti-German period). Obviously there were exceptions. Oldfather did not die until 1945. The rise of scientific epigraphy and papyrology, the fields in which most historians of classical scholarship have seen the most permanent contributions of American scholars, are unthinkable without fundamental German preparation. On the other hand Theodor Mommsen often said "Dumm wie ein Epigraphiker." His son-in-law Wilamowitz "Dumm wie Hiller" (his son-in-law, the epigraphist Hiller von Gaertringen). Epigraphy was a valuable but lower discipline, something between archaeology and *Wortphilologie* that prepared the way for others.

One should recall that for classics in America this period was one of loss and discouragement. The Latin requirement for the B.A. in American colleges was almost uniformly dropped. This caused immediately a drop in Latin teaching in the schools. Greek had always been marginal. Latin survived in Catholic schools and the better private schools. The world-wide depression had affected hiring in the universities. With drops in enrollment classical positions were especially vulnerable. American classicists themselves seemed unable to better the situation. In short the profession needed help and change.<sup>14</sup>

Help and change came in an unexpected and external form. I in 1966 and Volker Losemann in 1978 in his book *Nationalsozialismus und Antike* have sought to document the influence on American classics of the so-called *Säuberungswelle*, that is legalized firing on racist and political grounds of scholars and teachers. Fleming and Bailyn's comprehensive work on the Intellectual Migration revealingly has no chapter on classics. They must have thought the field too marginal to include. Some twenty immigrants, often gaining posts at prestigious American universities in a depression when few posts were available for the natives, wrought considerable change. These immigrants were either Jews, husbands of Jews, or Kurt von Fritz. That they existed at all proves a difference between classics in Germany and

<sup>14</sup> Typical for the time is: A. F. West (ed.), *Value of the Classics* (Princeton 1917), a collection of testimonia by influential Americans. One is struck today by the paucity of Jews and women among those giving testimonies. Out of 298 testimonials two derive from women (Lucy Martin Donnelly and Virginia C. Gildersleeve) and two certainly from Jews (James Loeb and Mortimer Schiff, his brother-in-law). Classics, as in England and unlike Prussia, remained a bastion of the male WASP Establishment.

classics in the United States. There was in Germany a tradition of Jewish classical scholars. In Prussia antisemitism was legalized and therefore less lethal. To be an *Ordinarius* a Jew had to be baptized. This produced the so-called *Taufjuden*. Most famous are the brothers Jacob and Michael Bernays. Jacob remained orthodox and a librarian until his death; Michael was baptized and won the Munich *Ordinariat*. *Selbsthaß* often characterized these *Taufjuden*. Friedrich Leo belonged to the *Kränzchen* of Paul de Lagarde and opposed the orthodox student Heinemann, who had to turn to the blond and blue-eyed Prussian Wilamowitz-Moellendorff for help.<sup>15</sup> The antisemitism of Beloch, Jacoby and Norden is attested. But there were also Eduard Hiller and Karl Lehrs.<sup>16</sup> Among Wilamowitz' great Jewish students were Eduard Fraenkel, Paul Friedländer, Felix Jacoby and Paul Maas. I do not know that Gildersleeve, Oldfather or Shorey had a Jewish doctoral student. We shall see how much more effective American antisemitism was.

Without the Nazi racist laws this great win for American classics would not have been possible. Before 1935 no German classical scholar had emigrated to the United States with one exception. Because of a quarrel with Noack that impeded his hope for advancement, the archaeologist, then a professor at Berlin, Valentin Müller (1889–1945), in 1931 accepted an associate professorship at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania, where he taught until his death.<sup>17</sup> There had been earlier guest professorships. Eduard Meyer at Harvard in 1909–10 was the most famous. Wilamowitz was invited to Chicago, but declined with a laugh. There had been visiting lecturers, Wilhelm Dörpfeld lectured in the United States in order to pay for central heating in his Ithaca home. The fact remains that if not compelled these scholars would never have emigrated.

The influence of this band of immigrants may best be discerned under five headings.

### I. The Revival of the German Tradition in American Classical Studies

This meant first an emphasis on Greek rather than Latin studies. Gildersleeve, Oldfather and Shorey, as well as the lesser men, Goodwin, Seymour and Smyth, had all been Hellenists. Of the immigrants in

<sup>15</sup> C. Hoffmann, "Antiker Völkerhass und moderner Rassenhass: Heinemann an Wilamowitz," *Quaderni di storia* 25 (1987) 145–57.

<sup>16</sup> J. Glucker, "Juden in der deutschen klassischen Philologie," *Jahrbuch des Instituts für deutsche Geschichte*, Beiheft 10 (Tel-Aviv 1986) 95–111. There are a number of errors and omissions.

<sup>17</sup> For Valentin Müller see T. R. S. Broughton, *Archäologenbildnisse: Porträts und Kurzbiographien von Klassischen Archäologen deutscher Sprache*, ed. R. Lullies and W. Schiering (Mainz 1988) 244–45, where no reason for his exile is given. Professor Broughton informs me *per coll.* that Müller would never reveal the reason for his emigration and that at his death the name of no relation was known. For the quarrel with Noack see F. Matz, *Archäologische Erinnerungen aus sechs Jahrzehnten (1910–70)* (Bochum 1975) 29–30. In his *Gnomon* obituary Matz had given no reason.

philology only Lenz was a Latinist. He ended in far off Texas, exerted little influence and had few if any doctoral students. The influential men were Hellenists, Jaeger, von Fritz, Friedländer, Raubitschek, Solmsen and Turyn. Until this day there is a scarcity of Latinists in the United States. Of the Latinists we do produce, the most are notoriously in poetry, not prose. This certainly reflects the influence of Wilamowitz on Leo and Norden, whom he caused to prefer Latin poetry as he did Greek poetry.

The immigrants in their publications and lectures and seminars cited German secondary literature. American doctoral programs in classics had preserved a German requirement, usually a three-hour translation examination before the doctorate could be awarded. But a requirement is not the best way to encourage interest. The immigrants made us want to read German because the books and articles were made to sound so intelligent and stimulating. I came to Wilamowitz entirely because of Werner Jaeger, not because of any of my American professors at Harvard, who cited German—when they did cite German—with a sigh. Look at the notes in Jaeger's *Paideia* and in Friedländer's *Plato* to take only two famous and widely-read books by the immigrants that were translated into English.

Sir Kenneth Dover has remarked that what was most memorable for him about Eduard Fraenkel was the great seriousness with which Fraenkel took the calling of scholar. This was precisely my experience with Werner Jaeger at Harvard (1952–56). He remarked to me when I was 19 years old: "The trouble with American classical scholars is that they are only classicists from 9:00 am until 5:00 pm five days a week. One must always be a scholar, every moment of one's life." Our American teachers were dilettantes. Like Gildersleeve and his contemporaries, we learned seriousness from the Germans.<sup>18</sup> The importance of this legacy cannot be overemphasized. It is the quintessence of the difference between the English and the German traditions. Scholarship, that is both research and teaching, was something central and of extraordinary importance. It was not, as it was to Jowett, useless or, as to Housman, higher crossword.

In college and university education at the better institutions the German method, lectures and seminars, had long since replaced English tutorials. On the other hand personal continuity had been broken. None of my teachers had studied in Germany. Several had in Greece and in England. None of their teachers had taken the German doctorate, although their teachers' teachers had (Smyth and Goodwin). Jaeger's graduate seminars certainly formed the pedagogical model for seminars later taught throughout the USA by his students. Normally he took an important text of difficulty and offered it as subject of the annual graduate seminar. I shared in the

<sup>18</sup> A revealing document for the extraordinary impact of German professors on a young American student is James Morgan Hart, *German Universities: A Narrative of Personal Experience* (New York 1874) (Göttingen, Berlin and Leipzig in the 1850s). He is struck especially by the seriousness of the professorial calling.

seminars on Aeschylus' *Supplices*, Aristotle's *Ethica Nicomachea* and Pseudo-Longinus' *De sublimitate*. He used in these seminars what he called "the Berlin method." That was the intensive study of texts difficult for reasons of palaeography, language or content. The emphasis was always on thorough understanding rather than speed. In a semester-long seminar on Aeschylus' *Supplices* we read only through the first 233 verses. What we learned was the enormous difficulty of the task. Jaeger, in the Wilamowitzian tradition, occasionally offered a seminar or lectures on a subject rather than on an author as the Americans and English did. The seminar was the mixed constitution. The approach was philological, the careful study of chosen texts from Tyrtæus to the American Constitution. The lectures concerned "the transition from Hellenism to Christianity," again based on texts from the Septuagint Apocrypha to Clemens Alexandrinus. Both of these were histories of ideas but taught by the historical philological method. What Jaeger meant by a seminar is best illustrated by his answer to my question, "What do you think of Fraenkel's *Agamemnon*?" He answered: "It is not a book. It is a seminar."

Two corollaries must be added here. I emphasize Jaeger because Jaeger was so inspiring a teacher. In the hands of lesser men the Berlin method became a bore, pedantry for its own sake and a scrupulous avoidance of ideas. Herbert Bloch was a *Witzfigur* even among undergraduates. I took Juvenal with him and whenever a town or hill was mentioned by the poet, he would pass an elderly postcard around the room, assuming wrongly that this would make the text alive. His graduate seminar on Greek historiography consisted in the monotonous recital of old lecture notes. I sometimes corrected him because I had read more recent secondary literature. This angered him and he invited me to dinner one evening at the Harvard Faculty Club to ask me why I hated him. I recalled this years later when Douglas Young remarked, "the best students are the students that disagree."

Paradoxically Jaeger had very few doctoral students. The few that he had were regularly women or Jesuits. Of course there were occasional exceptions. What distinguished women and Jesuits was that they did not need jobs. Most women married and Jesuits had already secured their future. Young men at Harvard who needed positions flocked to Sterling Dow. It was still very much the old boy system. Dow regularly attended the annual philological and archaeological conventions and was active in the Classical Association of New England as well as founder of the Classical Teachers of New England. He introduced his boys to prominent people and firmly believed that it was the duty of the dissertation director to place his student in his first job. Jaeger always remained a *Fremdling* in his new *Heimat* and simply could not compete. One should recall that even in Berlin he never had the influence with Becker that Wilamowitz had earlier had with Althoff.

## II. The Introduction of *Kunstgeschichte* in Place of *Dreckarchäologie*

James Loeb, who could not get an academic post in America because he was a Jew, when he died in 1931 left to the American School of Classical Studies in Athens the money with which they bought the Agora. The Agora dig became the American dig par excellence. Generations of students have been taught there and later at Corinth and elsewhere. The emphasis was on dirt archaeology, details of stratigraphy, potsherds, rooftiles, drainage systems and architectural remains. There had been a *Trivialisierung* of the subject. Epigraphy with wars over three- or four-bar sigmas flourished while no one spoke about sculpture or even vase painting. Museologists made catalogues but they had no students. That is until the Germans arrived. Margarete Bieber at Columbia, Otto J. Brendel at Indiana and then Columbia, G. M. A. Hanfmann at Harvard, Valentin Müller at Bryn Mawr and, after the war, Peter von Blanckenhagen at Chicago and then the Institute for Fine Arts in New York. Dietrich von Bothmer, because he was always a museologist, concerned, under the influence of the Englishman Sir John Beazley, with details of vase painting never had comparable influence. American art historians like Evelyn Byrd Harrison, the student of Bieber, and Jerome Pollitt, the great student of Brendel, were unthinkable before 1935.

## III. Popularization of the Legacy of Greece and Rome

Before 1915 there had been no need to popularize. Latin and occasionally Greek requirements, in schools and at the leading universities, provided captive hordes of students and teaching positions for all who wanted them. By 1935 this was no longer the case. The immigrants were hampered by lack of English from becoming fluent lecturers overnight. On the other hand they had been taught by great lecturers and were accustomed to lecturing to large classes. Jaeger was as in so much else the exception. His Third Humanism sought to revive the ideas of Greek antiquity so that Weimar Germany could learn directly from them. It ended in failure for a number of reasons. But oddly it took on a second life in the United States; for Jaeger gained two influential apostles. His Harvard colleague J. H. Finley presented Greek texts to hundreds of first-year students as documents from which they could learn something that was of lasting importance in their lives. Gilbert Highet reached a wider audience than Harvard freshmen. He translated three volumes of *Paideia* and by popular publications and weekly radio talks he presented the legacy of Greece and Rome to the American middle class. He came as near to doing for America what Jaeger had done for Germany.<sup>19</sup> Like Jaeger in the end he failed. American

<sup>19</sup> For Highet's achievement see my necrology at *Gnomon* 50 (1978) 430-32 and T. A. Suits, "Gilbert Highet," in Briggs and Calder (above, note 3) 183-91. For Jaeger, see now

*Banausentum* was not going to be civilized by classical humanism. At the end of his life Jaeger wrote:<sup>20</sup>

Ohne die dauernde Geltung der antiken Idee des Menschen in der menschlichen Kultur schwebt die klassische Altertumswissenschaft in der Luft. Wer dies nicht sieht, der sollte nach Amerika kommen und sich vom Gang der Entwicklung der klassischen Studien dort belehren lassen.

#### IV. The Opening up of Classical Posts to American Jews

Eduard Meyer shrewdly observed the hypocrisy of American egalitarianism during the WASP ascendancy:<sup>21</sup>

Wenn ein Jude erwähnt wird, wird einem zugeflüstert: ein gescheiter und gewandter Mann, but an awful Hebrew, you know; in die Sommerfrischen in New Hampshire und den Nachbargebieten wird kein Jude als Unsiedler zugelassen, und wenn er noch so viel dafür zahlen will, und es ist mir begegnet, daß man sich bei mir entschuldigt hat, daß man zu einem intimeren Zusammensein auch einen Juden aufgefordert habe, das habe sich leider aus bestimmten Gründen nicht vermeiden lassen. So gibt es denn Fälle, wo judische Gelehrte, weil ihnen in Amerika jede Aussicht zum Vorwärtskommen versperrt war, eine Stellung in Deutschland angenommen haben; denn hier denkt und handelt man, trotz alles Geredes, in diesen Dingen viel liberaler als drüben.

Antisemitism in American was illegal. Freedom of Religion was guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. But the American Gentlemen's Agreement was far more effective in excluding Jews from the academy than Prussian antisemitic legislation had ever been.<sup>22</sup> Disciplines also differed.

W. M. Calder III (ed.), *Werner Jaeger Reconsidered*, ICS Suppl. 3 (Atlanta 1992).

<sup>20</sup> W. Jaeger, *Scripta Minora I* (Rome 1960) xxvi.

<sup>21</sup> E. Meyer, *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika: Geschichte, Kultur, Verfassung und Politik* (Frankfurt a. M. 1920) 173. For Meyer in America see above, note 2.

<sup>22</sup> That is, American antisemitism was British rather than German; see B. Wasserstein, *Britain and the Jews of Europe 1939-1945*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford and New York 1988). There had long been a *numerus clausus* of about 6% for admission of Jewish students to the good universities. This has now been treated honestly for the first time; see D. A. Oren, *Joining the Club: A History of Jews at Yale* (New Haven and London 1985). A similar problem has arisen recently with disclosure of a secret *numerus clausus* for Asian students. A further irritant for Jewish students, even when they were thoroughly secularized, was the persistence of required chapel services in some cases as late as 1960. By then non-Jewish students at Princeton signed up for the Jewish service which was on Friday as that would release them from returning to the university on Sunday morning. The requirement, that is, ended a self-parody and was dropped. Such a *numerus clausus* for Jewish students began in Germany only with the Nazis and before 1933 was furiously resisted; for contemporary newspaper accounts see D. L. Niewyk, *Socialist, Anti-Semite, and Jew: German Social Democracy Confronts the Problem of Anti-Semitism 1918-1933* (Baton Rouge 1971)

Anthropology from the start was liberal, Jewish (Boas) and open to women. Classics was conservative. Women were confined to girls' colleges. Margarete Bieber was never more than associate professor at Columbia and upon retiring was denied the title of emeritus. With one exception on the West Coast (Monroe Deutsch) no American Jew received a tenured post in classics in America before a European Jew had.<sup>23</sup> European Jews broke this prejudice for a simple reason. If a Jew were present at the meeting, no American would dare bring up the Jewish objection. Let us look at two American scholars whom Meyer presumably had in mind and two others who stayed.

1. James Loeb was the greatest benefactor American classics ever had. He endowed the Loeb Classical Library. He endowed the Charles Eliot Norton Lectureship for the American Institute of Archaeology. He endowed the Norton Fellowship for the American School. He left the American School the money with which to purchase the Athenian Agora. He could not achieve an American career in classics because he was a Jew. His teacher Norton advised him to go to France. In fact he chose exile near Munich. He received honorary degrees from Cambridge, Oxford and Munich but never one from Harvard. The income from the Loeb Library is funneled today directly into the Harvard Classics Department and contributes to making it one of the richest in the world.<sup>24</sup>

2. Alfred Gudeman, editor of Tacitus, *Dialogus de oratoribus* and Aristotle, *Poetica* and author of a brief history of classical scholarship, was denied tenure at Pennsylvania and sought refuge in Germany, where he secured a post at the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. He lived and worked there until old age. He died in Theresienstadt.<sup>25</sup>

3. Moses Hadas, one of the most influential classicists of his generation in the U.S., was kept instructor for 15 years at Columbia at a salary so low that he was forced to write books that sold. He only gained tenure after the European Jews had broken the barrier. He became very much a Leo-Norden type, embarrassed by orthodoxy and integrated into Anglo-Saxon society but with the "religion of Hellenism" and never Christianity.<sup>26</sup>

159 ff. S. Klingenstein, *Jews in the American Academy 1900-1940* (New Haven 1991) is superficial and uninformed.

<sup>23</sup> For Monroe Deutsch (1879-1955) see J. Fontenrose, *Classics at Berkeley: The First Century, 1869-1970* (Berkeley 1982) 37. Fontenrose typically conceals the fact that he was Jewish. He received his associate professorship in 1919 but three years later went into administration. This could not have happened on the East Coast until almost 50 years later.

<sup>24</sup> See my "Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to James Loeb: Two Unpublished Letters," *ICS* 2 (1977) 315-32, where the details of Loeb's life are gathered.

<sup>25</sup> See D. W. Hurley, "Alfred Gudeman, Atlanta, Georgia, 1862—Theresienstadt, 1942," *TAPA* 120 (1990) 355-81.

<sup>26</sup> See my "Hadas, Moses," *Dictionary of American Biography: Supplement 8* (1966-

4. Harry Caplan of Cornell, editor of the *Loeb Auctor ad Herennium*, was an early example of an American Jew in classics. The case is of interest because a letter has survived dated "Ithaca, March 27, 1919" to Caplan, aged 23, signed by four non-Jewish colleagues in which they assure him of their friendship and that they are not anti-semites and advise that he go into school-teaching because, as a Jew in America, he has no future at the university level.<sup>27</sup>

5. The case of Paul Shorey, who is on the other side of the fence, is revealing. Benedict Einarson, his successor in the Chicago chair, informed me in 1958 that Shorey "always gave Jewish students more difficult qualifying examinations." This was common American practice with blacks in other subjects until 25 years ago.

## V

There is another effect that the immigrants had, one that has not yet been noted. The immigrants (I do not mean those who came to the U.S. as boys, e.g., T. G. Rosenmeyer and Martin Ostwald) remained Germans living in the United States, with German wives in German homes. They never became pseudo-Americans. A few, Kurt von Fritz and Ernst Kapp, like Rudolph Pfeiffer and Felix Jacoby in England, returned to Germany permanently after the war. Some, like Hermann Fränkel and A. E. Raubitschek, enjoyed guest professorships and others, like G. M. A. Hanfmann and Friedrich Solmsen, accepted honorary degrees bestowed by repentant West German universities. Margarete Bieber became honorary senator of the University of Giessen. I do not know any, other than Lehmann, that remained embittered. Margarete Bieber told me that she sent CARE packages in 1945-47 to German colleagues, some of whom had denounced her or refused to communicate with her in the Nazi period. W. H. Auden in 1940 taught at the New School for Social Research in New York, where there were a number of European exiles. He remarked perceptively:<sup>28</sup> "Quite a good place but O so German of 1925—and they seem to have learned nothing since." That holds true of the classical scholars. They were between two worlds, no longer Germans, but never Americans, isolated more from their colleagues and children than from their students.

---

70), ed. J. A. Garraty and M. C. Cames (New York and London 1988) 235-37 and *CO* 69 (1991/92) 8-9.

<sup>27</sup> See the publication of the document at *Cornell Alumni News* 84 (July 1981) 7 and B. vom Brocke, *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren* (above, note 3) 680 n. 43, who republishes the letter with valuable comment and bibliography.

<sup>28</sup> H. Carpenter, *W. H. Auden. A Biography* (Boston 1981) 295.

For us, the students, they were exotic and, therefore, more interesting than just another American teacher. There was also a less creditable reason why the refugees attracted students. They marked easily. Jaeger was famous during doctoral orals for asking long questions and then answering them himself. It never occurred to him that the American student would know the answer. This attitude of good-natured contempt was more dangerous when applied to colleagues. I asked him once why he had supported, against Sterling Dow, Cedric H. Whitman for tenure at Harvard. He replied, "What does it matter? They are all the same." Kapp at Columbia never learned English but he did learn that if he gave every student an A no student would complain about his teacher's lack of English. The refugees made some thirty years of students familiar with German professors. This in turn prepared the way for the wave of German immigration ca. 1970-90.

## VI. The Second Emigration: 1970 to the Present

Students became professors. For me to have a German colleague was not so strange as it had been for my American teachers. This familiarity has been aided by the rise of Humboldt Stipendia and the frequency of German visitors whether as guest professors, guest lecturers, or research fellows of various sorts. But the refugee scholars had prepared the way. Within the field of classics a second wave of German immigrants occurred beginning about 1970. There were two reasons for this.

First the so-called *Studentenunruh* and University Reform in Western Germany claimed its victims, usually men who had painted themselves into corners and could no longer survive in the intense political atmosphere of the time. Winfried Bühler and Walther Ludwig briefly held posts in the United States but never took American citizenship. They returned to their country when matters settled down, albeit not to the universities which they had left. G. N. Knauer, a leader of the opposition to reform at the Freie Universität in West Berlin, fled to the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, where he published nothing, taught reluctantly and took early retirement.

Secondly, the seventies and eighties saw a decline in classical philology in the Federal Republic, both in schools and universities. Such a decline does not occur abruptly and young academics were caught unawares by the change. This meant that highly educated young men of ability could not obtain posts in their own country. Among the emigrants of this last period are Karl Galinsky (Texas), Albert Henrichs (Harvard), Ludwig Koenen (Michigan), Eckard Schütrumpf (Colorado) and the German Swiss Kurt Raaflaub (Brown). These men uniformly have been successful in America in marked contrast to the English immigrants. The reason is not only the old one. The American university system with its lectures and seminars is fundamentally German rather than English. There is another more sinister reason.

The last twenty years have seen the rise in American universities of an administrative class. These administrators emerging on the analogy of Big Business see the universities as factories with themselves as management and the professors as labor. American professors are no longer allowed to elect their presidents, vice presidents and deans. They often do not set their own salaries. Only with the approval of an administrator are they allowed a new appointment and regularly an administrator not a colleague writes the letter of appointment. The salaries of administrators are regularly two to five times that of a professor of equal age. European colleagues often ask me why academics "in the land of the free and the home of the brave" are such cowards. The reason is that they have grown accustomed since their student days to consider themselves the inferiors of their administrators, who are usually failed scholars (who expectedly detest scholars) or ruthless businessmen. Our system is far closer to the former East German system where the party rules the faculty. The West German immigrants come from a different tradition, where the title professor is the highest the university can bestow. They speak up to deans in a way that Americans no longer dare. It is an open secret in America that the way to save a threatened department is to hire a German chairman.

A final change in American classics deserves notice. It was not caused directly by the refugee scholars but as their American exile was caused by National Socialism so was this change. I mean the introduction of lecture courses on classics in English translation. The fact that American classics has not become an *Orchideenfach* is due entirely to these courses. In 1945-46 with disarmament hundreds of thousands of young men returned to the United States. Under the G.I. Bill of Rights they were entitled to a college education. Their fathers had never been to the university. They had not attended elite schools. They were without Greek or Latin. Several farsighted American classicists, men like Moses Hadas, Gilbert Highet and J. H. Finley, often against the wishes of their senior colleagues, who called them betrayers of their subject, introduced courses like Greek tragedy in English translation or the Classical Tradition. More recently we find Women in Antiquity or the Sexual life of the Ancients. Such courses had never been taught before in the United States and they were unknown in England. But Wilamowitz had lectured to 600 in the Aula of the Berlin University on Greek literature in translation and so had Jaeger. Again we successfully imitated the Germans.

Sometimes good things happen for bad reasons. Neither King George III nor Adolf Hitler did what he did with the intent of benefitting American classics but in fact these two men caused American classics to become a professional, productive German discipline rather than to remain shallow English upperclass dilettantism. This fact reveals another unexpected fact. So other-worldly and in the American sense "academic" (that is useless and unnecessary) a discipline as American classics is entirely dependent upon a *Weltpolitik* which most of its practitioners prefer to denigrate and ignore.

## Appendix

The following is an alphabetical list of eighteen leading refugee scholars of the thirties in the field of classical studies with their dates and the American institutions where they taught. References are given to the authoritative biographical material. Those who arrived in the United States young enough to be educated there (e.g., Martin Ostwald and T. G. Rosenmeyer) are not included. Heinrich Gomperz and his pupil Philip Merlan were philosophers rather than philologists and, therefore, are excluded. For the appalling exploitation of the helpless Heinrich Gomperz by the University of Southern California see Wallace Nethery, *Dr. Flewelling and the Hoose Library: Life and Letters of a Man and an Institution* (Los Angeles 1976) 76 ff.

1. Elias J. Bickerman (1897–1981): M. Smith, *Gnomon* 54 (1982) 223–24 and in E. J. Bickerman, "Religions and Politics in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," ed. E. Gabba and M. Smith, *Biblioteca di Athenaeum* 5 (Como 1985) ix–xii with a full bibliography (xiii–xxxvii) by F. Parente (Columbia University).

2. Margarete Bieber (1879–1978): E. B. Harrison, *AJA* 82 (1978) 573–75; L. Bonfante, *Gnomon* 51 (1979) 621–24 and "Margarete Bieber (1879–1978): An Archaeologist in Two Worlds," in *Women as Interpreters of the Visual Arts*, ed. C. R. Sherman and A. M. Holcomb (Westport and London 1981) 238–74; W. M. Calder III, *DAB* Suppl. 10 (forthcoming) (Columbia University).

3. Herbert Bloch (b. Berlin 1911) (Harvard).

4. Otto J. Brendel (1901–1973): W. M. Calder III, "Otto Brendel 1901–73," *Archäologenbildnisse* (above, note 17) 283–84 (Washington University, St. Louis; Indiana University; Columbia University).

5. Ludwig Edelstein (1902–1965): H. Cherniss, *Year Book of the American Philosophical Society* (1965) 130–38; H. Diller, *Gnomon* 38 (1966) 429–32; F. Kudlien, *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 21 (1966) 173–78 (Johns Hopkins University).

6. Hermann Fränkel (1888–1977): K. von Fritz, *Gnomon* 50 (1978) 618–21; B. Snell, "Philologie von Heute und Morgen: Die Arbeiten Hermann Fränkels," *Gesammelte Schriften* (Göttingen 1966) 211–12 (Stanford University).

7. Paul Friedländer (1882–1968): W. Bühler, *Gnomon* 41 (1969) 619–23; W. M. Calder III, "The Credo of a New Generation: Paul Friedländer to Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff," *Antike und Abendland* 26 (1980) 90–102 (University of California at Los Angeles).

8. Kurt von Fritz (1900–1985): H. Flashar, "Forschung als Spiegel des Lebens," *FAZ* 26 July 1985; W. Ludwig and G. Jäger, *In memoriam Kurt von Fritz 1900–1985. Gedenkrede von Walther Ludwig mit einem von*

Gerhard Jäger zusammengestellten Schriftenverzeichnis (Munich 1986); E. Vogt, "Kurt von Fritz 25. 8. 1900–16. 7. 1985," *Jahrbuch der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1987 (Munich 1988) 247–53; C. Wegeler, "Kurt v. Fritz verweigert den Gehorsamseid auf Hitler," *Die Selbstbeschränkung der Wissenschaft: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie seit dem ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert, untersucht am Beispiel des Instituts für Altertumskunde der Universität Göttingen (1921–62)* (Diss. Vienna 1985) 128–34 (Columbia University).

9. George M. A. Hanfmann (1911–1986): A. H. Borbein, *Archäologenbildnisse* (above, note 17) 313–14 (Harvard University).

10. Werner W. Jaeger (1888–1961): W. M. Calder III, "The Correspondence of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff with Werner Jaeger," *HSCP* 82 (1978) 303–47; "Werner Jaeger and Richard Harder: An Erklärung," *Quaderni di storia* 17 (1983) 99–121; "Werner Jaeger," *Berlinische Lebensbilder Geisteswissenschaftler*, ed. M. Erbe, *Einzelveröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin* 60 (Berlin 1989) 343–63; "Werner Jaeger," in Briggs and Calder (above, note 3) 211–26; *Werner Jaeger the Man and his Work*, ed. W. M. Calder III, *ICS Supplement* 3 (forthcoming) (University of Chicago; Harvard University).

11. Ernst Kapp (1887–1978): E. Mensching, *LuGiB* 33 (1989) 35–36 (Columbia University).

12. Karl Lehman (1894–1960): W. Fuchs and E. Burck, *Archäologenbildnisse* (above, note 17) 262–63 (Institute of Fine Arts of New York University).

13. Friedrich Walter Lenz, b. Levy (1896–1969): B. Kytzler, *Gnomon* 43 (1971) 526–27 (Connecticut Women's College; Southwestern University; University of Texas at Austin).

14. Otto Neugebauer (b. 1899) (Brown University; Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton).

15. Anthony Erich Raubitschek (b. Vienna 1912) (Yale; Princeton; Stanford).

16. Friedrich Solmsen (1904–1989): E. Mensching, "Zur Berliner Philologie in der späteren Weimarer Zeit—über Friedrich Solmsens Berliner Jahre (1922–33)," *Latein und Griechisch in Berlin* 33 (1989) 26–76; H. North, *Gnomon* 61 (1989) 751–59. For useful background see F. Solmsen, "Classical Scholarship in Berlin Between the Wars," *GRBS* 30 (1989) 117–40. (Olivet College; Cornell University; University of Wisconsin; University of North Carolina)

17. Alexander Turyn (1900–1981): M. Marcovich, *Gnomon* 54 (1982) 97–98 (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).

18. Felix M. Wassermann (1896–1976): V. Pöschl, "Felix Wassermann," *Bismarck-Gymnasium Karlsruhe Jahresbericht* (1975/76) 74–76, where date of birth is given as 1886 (Beloit College; Southwestern at

Memphis; Illinois College; Kansas-Wesleyan University; Marquette University).<sup>29</sup>

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

<sup>29</sup> Earlier versions of this paper were delivered at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, the University of Cologne and the City University of New York.